1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General	
2	of the State of California GREGORY J. SALUTE	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General KEVIN J. RIGLEY, State Bar No. 131800	
4	Deputy Attorney General 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702	
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 620-2558	
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804	
7	Attorneys for Complainant	
8	BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF OPTOMETRY	
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10	STATE OF CAL	IFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Petition to Revoke Probation Against:	Case No.
12		ΒΕΤΙΤΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΒΕΙΛΟ Υ Ε
13	BEN E. LU, O.D. 1103 ½ Fair Oaks Avenue South Pasadena, CA 91030	PETITION TO REVOKE PROBATION
14	Optometrist License No. OPT 11014	
15	-	
16	and	
17	BEN E. LU, O.D. 1727 Vermont Avenue #111	
18	Los Angeles, CA 90027 (branch office canceled on 2/1/03)	
19	Branch Office License No. BOL 6131	
20	and	
21	BEN E. LU, O.D. dba DREXL OPTOMETRIC CENTER	
22	3043 Foothill Blvd. #4	
23	La Crescenta, CA 91214 (expired on 1/31/08)	
24	Fictitious Name Permit No. FNP 3323	
25	Respondent.	
26		
27	///	
28	///	

Complainant alleges:

1,

PARTIES

- Mona Maggio (Complainant) brings this Petition to Revoke Probation solely in her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the State Board of Optometry,
 Department of Consumer Affairs.
- On or about March 3, 1998, the State Board of Optometry (Board) issued
 Optometrist License No. OPT 11014 to Ben E. Lu (Respondent). The Optometrist License will
 expire on April 30, 2010, unless renewed.
- 3. On or about February 16, 1999, the Board issued Branch Office License No. BOL 6131 to Respondent for a secondary practice location at 1727 N. Vermont Avenue, #111, Los Angeles, CA 90027. The Branch Office License expired on February 1, 2003.
- 4. On or about January 31, 2007, the Board issued Fictitious Name Permit No. FNP 3323 to Respondent for an additional practice location at 3043 Foothill Blvd. #4, La Crescenta, CA 91214. The Fictitious Name Permit expired on January 31, 2008.
- 5. In a disciplinary action entitled "In the Matter of Accusation Against: Ben Ei Lu," Case No. 1999-254, the Board issued a Decision, effective June 18, 2005, in which Respondent's Optometrist License and Branch Office License were revoked. However, the revocation was stayed and Respondent's licenses were placed on probation for a period of six (6) years with certain terms and conditions. A copy of that decision is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated by reference.

JURISDICTION

6. This Petition to Revoke Probation is brought before the Board under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

7. Section 118, subdivision (b), provides that the suspension/expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated.

8. Section 3090 states:

"Except as otherwise provided by law, the board may take action against all persons guilty of violating this chapter or any of the regulations adopted by the Board. The Board shall enforce and administer this article as to licenseholders, and the board shall have all the powers granted in this chapter for these purposes, including, but not limited to, investigating complaints from the public, other licensees, health care facilities, other licensing agencies, or any other source suggesting that an optometrist may be guilty of violating this chapter or any of the regulations adopted by the Board."

FIRST CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Obey all Laws)

9. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Probation Condition Number 2 stated:

"Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of optometry in California."

10. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 2, referenced above, in that he failed to obey all laws. Respondent violated section 3078, by practicing optometry under the Fictitious Business Name of Drexel Optometric Center. Though this fictitious business name was originally registered with the Board, Respondent failed to renew this registration and/or cancel said fictitious name permit. Respondent also violated section 3070, as evidenced by inconsistencies with the practice address that was registered with the Board. In September 2005, Respondent initiated a report of a change of address from Suite #1 to Suite #4 at 3043 Foothill Blvd., La Crescent, CA 91214. However, Respondent failed to complete the notification process to the Board and was therefore practicing at an unregistered location. In addition, Respondent has been practicing optometry at two confirmed Sterling Optical locations that are not registered with the Board. The practice locations are 5544 E. Whittier Blvd., Commerce, CA and 1103 Fair Oaks Ave., Pasadena, CA and as previously stated, Respondent has failed to register either of these two addresses of practice with the Board.

///

///

SECOND CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Cooperate with Probation Surveillance)

11. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Probation Condition Number 3 stated:

"Respondent shall comply with the Board's probation surveillance program; including but not limited to allowing access to the probationer's optometric practice(s) and patient records upon request of the Board or its agent."

12. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 3, referenced above, in that he failed to cooperate with probation surveillance. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent failed to comply with the self reporting portion of his probation. Respondent is required to submit a Quarterly Report of Compliance to the Board every 3 months. The last report that Respondent submitted is dated July 17, 2007.

THIRD CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Comply with Community Services - Free Services Provision)

13. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Probation Condition Number 7 stated:

"Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board for its prior approval a community service program in which Respondent shall provide free **NON-OPTOMETRIC SERVICES** on a regular basis to a community or charitable facility or agency for at least twenty (20) hours a month for the first thirty-six (36) months of probation."

14. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 7, referenced above, in that he has failed to submit a community service program to the Board for approval. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent failed to submit any documentation to the Board that he has complied with this condition. The last correspondence received from Respondent regarding this

issue is dated July 20, 2007. The Board sent Respondent a correspondence letter dated October 2, 2007 to his community service contact, which has not been answered.

FOURTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Provide Evidence of an Education Program)

15. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's probation, Probation Condition Number 8 stated:

"Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board for its prior approval a plan for completing an educational program or course(s), which shall not be less than 40 hours per year and which shall be completed during the first year of probation. The program or course(s) shall be in addition to the Continuing Optometric Education requirements for re-licensure, and shall be obtained with all costs being paid by Respondent. The program or course(s) shall be related to the causes for discipline alleged in Accusation No. 1999 254. Respondent will be responsible for locating the educational program and course(s), and submitting a plan for such program or course(s) to the Board for prior approval. Following the completion of each course, the Board or its designee may administer an examination to test Respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide written proof of attendance in such course or courses as are approved by the Board."

16. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 8, referenced above, in that he failed to provide evidence of an education program to the Board. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent failed to provide evidence to the Board that he has complied with the education program condition.

FIFTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Comply with Cost Recovery Requirements)

17. AT ALL TIMES AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF RESPONDENT'S PROBATION, PROBATION CONDITION NUMBER 10 STATED:

"Respondent shall pay to the Board costs associated with its investigation and enforcement pursuant to section 125.3 in the amount of \$24,247.25. Respondent shall be

permitted to pay these costs in a payment plan approved by the Board, with the total amount of \$24, 247.25 paid in full within the first five (5) years of probation."

18. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 10, referenced above, in that he failed to pay the cost recovery to the Board, as agreed. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent signed an agreement for a payment plan of \$410.97 each month, until June 2010. Respondent has made 13 payments of the currently required 35. The last payment Respondent made was received on or about July 19, 2007.

SIXTH CAUSE TO REVOKE PROBATION

(Failure to Comply with the Monitoring Condition of Probation)

19. At all times after the effective date of Respondent's Probation, Probation Condition Number 11 stated:

"Within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision, Respondent shall submit to the Board for its prior approval a plan of practice in which Respondent's practice shall be monitored by another optometrist, who shall provide periodic reports to the Board. Any cost for such monitoring shall be paid by Respondent.

"The monitoring plan shall include a review of patient records and corresponding billings, which will be chosen at random by the monitor. Monitoring of the Respondent's practice shall be in accordance with the Board's probation monitoring program, the guidelines of which are attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

"If the monitor resigns or is no longer available, Respondent shall, within 15 days, move to have a new monitor appointed, through nomination by Respondent and approval by the Board."

20. Respondent's probation is subject to revocation because he failed to comply with Probation Condition Number 11, referenced above, in that he failed to comply with the monitoring condition of his probation. The facts and circumstances regarding this violation are that Respondent discontinued the monitoring services provided by Dr. Carnevali, due to the possible sale of his practice. Respondent has failed to report to the Board if the practice has in

fact been sold, or if he has obtained another monitor. 1 2 /// 3 **PRAYER** 4 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein 5 alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board issue a decision: 6 1. Revoking the probation that was granted by the Board in Case No. 1999 7 254 and imposing the disciplinary order that was stayed thereby revoking Optometrist License 8 No. OPT 11014 issued to Respondent. 9 2. Revoking the probation that was granted by the Board in Case No. 1999 10 254 and imposing the disciplinary order that was stayed thereby revoking Branch Office License 11 12 No. BOL 6131 issued to Respondent. Revoking or suspending Optometrist License No. OPT 11014, issued to 13 Respondent. 14 Revoking or suspending Branch Office License No. BOL 6131 issued to 4. 15 Respondent. 16 Revoking or suspending Fictitious Name Permit No. FNP 3323 issued to 17 5. 18 Respondent. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 19 6. 20 21 22 23 24 Executive Officer State Board of Optometry 25 Department of Consumer Affairs State of California 26 Complainant 27

28

LA2008601580

bqw.78284£08 (80\2\01)x[

L7

ΔI

۶Į

τl

Exhibit A

Decision and Order

State Board of Optometry Case No. 1999-254